

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MONIQUE DIOSDADO,
Plaintiff,
v.
HUNTINGTON BEACH UNION
HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Defendant.

Case No. 8:24-cv-02490-FLA (KESx)

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY
THE ACTION SHOULD NOT BE
DISMISSED**

On November 14, 2024, Plaintiff Monique Diosdado (“Plaintiff” or “Diosdado”) initiated this action by filing a series of documents with the court, which Plaintiff identifies as:

1. Motion to Expedite
2. Main Appeal Motion
3. Motion to Add Claims of Systemic Neglect, Retaliation, Deliberate Indifference, and Discrimination
4. Motion to Redact Minor’s Full Name from All Public Filings
5. Exhibits

Dkt. 1 at 1.


1 There are multiple issues with Plaintiff's filings. First, Plaintiff's case-initiating
2 documents do not comply with the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil
3 Procedure (including Rules 3, 7(a)(1), 8, and 10) or the Local Rules (including Local
4 Rules 6-1, 7-3, 7-5, 7-19, 7-20, 8-1, 11-3, 11-6, 11-7, 11-8). These documents are
5 deficient and insufficient to bring a civil action in federal court.

6 Second, Plaintiff seeks to bring this action on behalf of S.D., a minor, and to
7 represent S.D. in *pro se*. See Dkt. 7 at 4–7. It is well settled that a non-attorney
8 “parent or guardian cannot bring an action on behalf of a minor child without retaining
9 a lawyer.” *Johns v. County of San Diego*, 114 F.3d 874, 876 (9th Cir. 1997); see also
10 *Grizzell v. San Elijo Elem. Sch.*, 110 F.4th 1177, 1180 (9th Cir. 2024) (recognizing
11 courts in the Ninth Circuit are “bound by *Johns*, which holds that a parent may not
12 proceed *pro se* on her children’s behalf”).

13 Accordingly, the court ORDERS Plaintiff to Show Cause (“OSC”) in writing,
14 on or before January 10, 2025, why the action should not be dismissed without
15 prejudice for: (1) failure to file a complaint that complies with the requirements of the
16 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rules; and (2) Plaintiff’s inability to
17 represent S.D. in this action in *pro se*. Plaintiff is advised that failure to file a
18 response to the OSC timely may result in the dismissal of the action without further
19 notice from the court.

20
21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22
23 Dated: December 4, 2024

24 
25 FERNANDO L. AENLLE-ROCHA
26 United States District Judge
27
28